

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 22-42 are pending in the present application. Claim 23 is amended by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, the specification was objected to; Claim 23 was objected to; and Claims 22-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Tone et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,686,536 B2, herein "Tone") in view of Gardiner et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,886,964 B2, herein "Gardiner").

Regarding the objection to the specification, the specification has been amended to include section headings as suggested by the outstanding Office Action. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this objection be withdrawn. In addition, Applicants respectfully submit that the specification without the claims has only ten pages.

Regarding the objection to Claim 23, Claim 23 has been amended as suggested by the outstanding Office Action. No new matter has been added. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested this objection be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 22-42 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Tone in view of Gardiner is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Briefly recapitulating, independent Claim 22 is directed to an optical filtering/electromagnetic screening structure to be joined to at least one transparent substrate. The structure includes at least first and second plastic sheets and either one or both of the first and second sheets incorporate at least one mineral pigment or at least one organic dye to produce, in respect of the structure, an orange filter for light of wavelength center on 590 nm.

In a non-limiting example, Figure 3 shows the substrate 20, and the first and second plastic sheets 10 and 12.

As disclosed in the specification at page 1, lines 23-29, in a plasma screen an intense orange radiation (590 nm) is generated and becomes unattractive to a viewer of the plasma screen. Therefore, the structure of Claim 22 advantageously removes the orange light as also disclosed in the specification at page 7, lines 15-20.

Turning to the applied art, Tone shows in Figure 1 an electromagnetic wave shielding plate that includes a substrate 5 on which an electrode 3 is provided and a transparent film 4 covers the transparent substrate 5 but not the electrode section 3. Based only on Figure 1 of Tone, the outstanding Office Action states at page 4, first full paragraph, that the claimed transparent substrate and the claimed second plastic sheet correspond to the transparent substrate 5 of Tone. In other words, the outstanding Office Action corresponds two distinct elements of Claim 22 with a single element of Tone.

However, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed at least one transparent substrate is a different element from the claimed second plastic sheet and thus, the outstanding Office Action should indicate two different elements in the applied art that correspond to the two claimed elements.

Further, the outstanding Office Action recognizes that Tone does not teach or suggest incorporating at least one mineral pigment or at least one organic dye to produce a filter for the light having a wavelength of 590 nm.

To cure this deficiency, the outstanding Office Action relies on Gardiner for teaching this feature. The outstanding Office Action states on page 4, second full paragraph, that Gardiner discloses this feature at column 9, lines 11-23 and at column 20, lines 31-36. However, Gardiner does not teach or suggest the claimed feature.

More specifically, Gardiner discloses at column 9, lines 11-23 that a frequency band of 597-662 nm corresponds to the orange color and discloses at column 20, lines 31-36 that Figure 3g shows that "radiation passing through area 3ga has a peak wavelength of 590 nanometers and that passing through area 3gc has a peak wavelength of 610 nm." However, this description of Gardiner considered in the context of Figure 3g indicates that the orange wavelength passes through the filter and is not blocked by the filter as required by independent Claim 1. In other words, the filter of Gardiner blocks all radiation except the orange light.

In addition, Gardiner does not teach or suggest that a plastic sheet includes at least one mineral pigment or at least one organic dye to achieve a filter for a light of wavelength centered on 590 nm, as required by Claim 22.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that independent Claim 22 and each of the claims depending therefrom patentably distinguish over Tone or Gardiner, either alone or in combination.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



---

Gregory J. Maier  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 03/06)

Remus F. Fetea, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 59,140